

1 David W. Affeld, State Bar No. 123922
2 Damion Robinson, State Bar No. 262573
3 David Markevitch, State Bar No. 256163
4 Affeld Grivakes LLP
5 2049 Century Park East, Ste. 2460
6 Los Angeles, CA 90067
7 Telephone: (310) 979-8700

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff
9 Michael Zeleny

10

11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
12 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

13 MICHAEL ZELENY,
14 Plaintiff,
15 vs.
16 GAVIN NEWSOM, *et al.*,
17 Defendants.

18 Case No. CV 17-7357 RS

19 Assigned to:
20 The Honorable Richard G. Seeborg

21 Assigned for Discovery Purposes to:
22 The Honorable Thomas S. Hixson

23

24 **PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF MOTION
25 AND MOTION TO COMPEL CHIEF
26 DAVE BERTINI TO ANSWER
27 DEPOSITION QUESTIONS**

28 Filed Concurrently:
1. Declaration of Damion Robinson;
2. Proposed Order.

Date: November 19, 2020
Time: 10:00 a.m.
Courtroom G – 15th Floor

Action Filed: December 28, 2017
Trial Date: [Not Set]

28 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

29 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on November 19, 2020 at 10:00 a.m. or as soon
30 thereafter as the matter may be heard before the Honorable Thomas S. Hixson in Courtroom G
31 of the above-entitled Court, Plaintiff Michael Zeleny (“Plaintiff”) will and hereby does move
32 for an order directing Defendant Chief Dave Bertini (“Bertini”), individually and as the Rule
33

1 30(b)(6) designee of the City of Menlo Park, to answer deposition questions that he was
2 improperly instructed not to answer and reasonable follow-up questions. This Motion is made
3 on the grounds that Bertini was improperly instructed not to answer on (i) grounds other than
4 attorney client privilege; and (ii) on privilege grounds where privilege does not apply.
5 Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 37-2, each question on which Zeleny seeks and order compelling
6 an answer is set out in **Appendix 1**.

7 PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that Zeleny seeks sanctions against
8 Bertini and his counsel, Todd H. Master, Howard, Rome, Martin & Ridley, LLP for the
9 estimated costs of completing the deposition, in the amount of \$2,000, under Fed. R. Civ. P.
10 37(a)(5)(A) and 30(d)(2) on the grounds that (i) sanctions are mandatory on a successful
11 motion to compel; and (ii) Bertini and counsel obstructed fair examination at his deposition.

12 This motion follows a conference of counsel. Robinson Decl. ¶ 2 & Ex. 1.

13 This Motion is based on this Notice of Motion and Motion, the accompanying
14 Declaration of Damion Robinson, the records and files herein, and such other matters as the
15 Court may consider.

16 Dated: October 9, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

17 s/ Damion Robinson
18 David W. Affeld
19 Damion D. D. Robinson
David Markevitch
Affeld Grivakes LLP

20 Attorneys for Plaintiff Michael Zeleny

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS & AUTHORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

Instructions not to answer on grounds other than privilege are improper and sanctionable. Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(c)(2). Counsel instructed Police Chief Dave Bertini (“Bertini”), the Rule 30(b)(6) designee of the City of Menlo Park (the “City”), not to answer multiple questions on grounds other than privilege and where no privilege applies. An order directing Bertini to answer those questions and reasonable follow-up questions is necessary. Sanctions are also appropriate for the costs of completing the deposition due to these improper instructions and other disruptive conduct by Bertini’s counsel.

First, counsel instructed Bertini not to answer questions that do not remotely implicate privilege. These include questions about whether Bertini found Zeleny’s protests to be offensive—going directly to Zeleny’s claim of content-based discrimination—and whether it is a standard practice to engage in “enforcement stops” to interrogate protestors. There is no legitimate argument that these topics seek privileged information. Instructions not to answer because a question has been asked before are not proper, particularly where a witness repeatedly fails to give a straight answer.

Second, counsel instructed Bertini not to answer questions where the privilege has plainly been waived—*e.g.*, as to the facts in Bertini’s interrogatory answers, and the City’s grounds for denying Zeleny’s permit applications. If Bertini, as the Rule 30(b)(6) designee of the City, cannot explain the basis for these assertions, the City cannot make them at trial. A party cannot use the privilege as both a sword and a shield.

Moreover, Bertini and his counsel should be sanctioned. Sanctions are mandatory on this Motion because counsel's instructions were not substantially justified. They are also appropriate because the conduct of Bertini and counsel intentionally impeded a fair examination. Bertini and counsel should pay the costs and fees of having to resume the deposition to ask questions that Bertini should have answered the first time around. These costs and fees are estimated at \$2,000.

1

2 **II. BACKGROUND**

3 Zeleny wants to protest a prominent tech executive and venture capital firm in
 4 Menlo Park. He has been peacefully protesting them for several years. *See* Second Am. Comp.
 5 ¶ 42, Dkt. No. 99. Before California enacted the “open carry” ban on firearms, he safely carried
 6 unloaded firearms to draw attention to his message. *Id.* ¶ 46.

7 Although Zeleny was peaceful and cooperative, the Menlo Park Police
 8 Department tried to find a “firm solution” to stop his protests. *Id.* ¶ 57. This included harassing
 9 Zeleny and his supporters, surveilling him, making a frivolous “enforcement stop” to interrogate
 10 a participant, and maintaining a surveillance file on Zeleny—which Bertini still maintains. *Id.*
 11 ¶¶ 86-91. All of this conduct was in violation of written department policy. These efforts
 12 culminated in a failed prosecution in 2012 to 2014. *Id.* ¶¶ 93-102.

13 After the “open carry” ban was enacted, the City has now taken the position that
 14 Zeleny cannot carry firearms without a film or special event permit. *Id.* ¶ 121. Zeleny applied
 15 for both. Bertini took charge of the permitting process and spearheaded the denial of the
 16 applications. Applying standards and procedures that they made up as they went along, City
 17 staff and the City Attorney denied both applications. *Id.* ¶¶ 138-186.

18 Zeleny filed this suit challenging the efforts to stop his protests and the defective
 19 process that led to the denial of his permits. He alleges that the permits were denied on content-
 20 based grounds, including because Bertini and others found his protests offensive. *Id.* ¶¶ 126-127.

21 Zeleny took the deposition of Chief Bertini, individually and as the Rule 30(b)(6)
 22 designee of the City. Per stipulation, the deposition occurred in two sessions on March 19, 2019
 23 and August 7, 2020. The transcript of the second session was completed in early September.
 24 Robinson Decl. ¶ 3.

25

26 **III. ARGUMENT**

27 “A person may instruct a deponent not to answer only when necessary to preserve
 28 a privilege, or to enforce a limitation ordered by the court, or to present a motion” to terminate or

1 limit the deposition. Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(c)(2). In all other circumstances the “testimony is taken
 2 subject to any objection.” *Id.*

3 Rule 30(b)(2) provides the “exclusive grounds” for instructions not to answer.
 4 *Doe v. Cty. of San Diego*, No. 12-689, 2013 WL 6577065, at *4 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 13, 2013). “A
 5 party may object to an irrelevant line of question, but instructing a witness not to answer a
 6 question because it calls for inadmissible facts is sanctionable.” *In re Stratosphere Corp. Sec.
 7 Litig.*, 182 F.R.D. 614, 618-19 (D. Nev. 1998).

8 **A. Counsel Instructed Bertini Not to Answer on Grounds Other than Privilege.**

9 Zeleny contends that the decision to deny his permit application was content
 10 based. At a public hearing, Bertini urged a denial of the application claiming that Zeleny’s
 11 protests could be deemed obscene as to minors – *i.e.* offensive. *Id.* When Zeleny’s counsel tried
 12 to depose Bertini about this, Bertini would not even confirm that he found Zeleny’s material
 13 offensive. He repeatedly evaded the question with counsel’s assistance.

14 Q. And was it your view, at the time that Mr. Zeleny filed his permit application for a
 15 special event permit, that the image reflected -- the animation that’s shown in
 Exhibit 38 could be obscene as to minors?

16 A. It could be.

17 Q. Did you take that position in a public hearing related to Mr. Zeleny’s permit
 18 application?

19 A. Yes. I stated it could be.

20 Q. Do you have a view, one way or another, at this point, about whether it is obscene
 21 as to minors or not?

22 A. It is actually -- as a police officer, I’m unable to have my peace disturbed, nor be
 offended, so I have no personal -- I have -- personally, I can’t be offended, so it
 would not be up to me whether it’s offensive or not. It would be up to a Court.

23 Q. When you say you can’t be offended, what do you mean?

24 A. In other words, I can’t be the victim.

25 Q. Okay. In your capacity as an individual witness, is the image offensive? Not
 26 asking in your capacity as a police officer, but as an individual witness in this
 case, is the animation that’s reflected in Exhibit 38 offensive?

27 **MR. MASTER: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous. Confusing. Overbroad. Calls for
 28 speculation. If you can answer it.**

29 A. For an adult, perhaps not; for a child, yeah.

1 Q. ...
2 Do you personally find it offensive?

3 **MR. MASTER: Objection. Asked and answered. Don't answer that. We're done**
4 **with this. He's already answered that question.**

5 Robinson Decl., Ex. 2 at 137:4-139:2.

6 "Asked and answered" is not a proper basis to instruct a witness not to answer. It
7 is not even a proper objection in the circumstances. The question was not asked, much less
8 answered. Zeleny's counsel was merely trying to get a straight answer from a witness who
9 repeatedly evaded the question. *See Hardin v. Mendocino Coast Dist. Hosp.*, No. 17-5554, 2019
10 WL 1855989, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 25, 2019) ("[t]here is nothing wrong with an attorney asking
11 the same question multiple times in a deposition"; noting "a certain amount of [repetition] is just
12 a normal part of cross-examination").

13 Bertini was similarly evasive about the City's policies for dealing with protestors,
14 again assisted by counsel. Robinson Decl., Ex. 3 at 198-202. He claimed that he could not
15 answer whether pulling over Zeleny's supporters to question them about their association with
16 Zeleny was consistent with typical practice in the department. After repeated avoidance of the
17 question and interjections from counsel, *id.* at 198-200, the following exchange ensued:

18 Q. I'm not asking whether it was right or wrong for the officer to stop the
19 vehicle. I'm asking if this conduct of following a vehicle, engaging in an
enforcement stop, and ... questioning the driver about his association with
a protestor is consistent with typical police practice in the city of Menlo
Park.

20 **MR. MASTER: I'm going to continue to object to that question as being**
21 **vague and ambiguous. It's also argumentative, and I'd like to tell you why, if**
22 **you'd let me.**

23 MR. ROBINSON: I would appreciate it if you don't.

24 **MR. MASTER: Okay. Well, then, he can answer it one more time. And when**
25 **he's done with that, he's done with that question, and we'll move on.**

26 A. So long as the officer had reasonable suspicion to stop the vehicle, he
27 could ask any questions, whether it's about a protestor, whether it's about a
drug deal he just saw, whether it's about a gang membership he has or a
gang person he just spoke to. That can happen.

28 Q. Is there any reason you're unable to answer my question about whether it's
typical police practice to follow a car like this?

MR. MASTER: Objection. Argumentative. Asked and answered. Don't

answer that question. Move on.

Id. at 201:5-202:10.

Again, “asked and answered” is not a proper basis to instruct a witness not to answer, particularly when he refuses to answer the question. Nor is “argumentative.” If the questioning was unduly hostile—and it wasn’t—the proper remedy was to terminate the deposition. *See Redwood v. Dobson*, 476 F.3d 462, 467 (“Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(d) specifies how harassment is to be handled. Counsel for the witness may halt the deposition and apply for a protective order … but must not instruct the witness to remain silent.”).

B. Counsel Instructed Bertini Not to Answer Based on Inapplicable Privileges.

1. The Official Information Privilege Does Not Apply to the Names of Protestors on Whom the City Maintains Surveillance Files.

Counsel would not allow Bertini to identify other protestors on whom Bertini maintains surveillance files, citing official information privilege and “law enforcement privileges.”¹ Robinson Decl., Ex. 4 at 273:6-274:22; *see also generally id.* at pp. 272-274. These supposed privileges do not apply to identifying protestors about whom the Bertini maintains files. Zeleny seeks this information to determine whether the City has a widespread practice of surveilling protestors, which would support his claim that the City violated his First Amendment rights.

The parties have already briefed official information privileges based on the City's similar objections to written discovery. *See* Dkt. Nos. 115 (Letter Brief), 116 (Discovery Order); 117 (Discovery Order). As the Court recognized the last time the City made a blanket "official information" argument, the privilege does not apply to ordinary police records. The City must "make a substantial threshold showing" that the information sought to be disclosed "would harm significant law enforcement or privacy interests." See Discovery Order, Dkt. No. 117 at p. 2; *Kelly v. City of San Jose*, 114 F.R.D. 653, 669 (N.D. Cal. 1987). It must present "specific information" through competent testimony. *Id.* (emphasis in *Kelly*). Just as last time,

¹ Counsel clarified that the record did not accurately reflect his objections. See Robinson Decl., Ex. 1 (“the reporter clearly did not hear the objections correctly over Zoom”).

1 the City cannot make this showing.

2 The mere identity of the protestors would not significantly harm law enforcement or
 3 privacy interests, particularly those not under active investigation. Zeleny did not seek any of
 4 the substantive information the City has about these protestors, but merely their names. Their
 5 names are not privileged.

6 **2. The City Cannot Invoke Privilege to Avoid Disclosing the Basis for Its
 7 Position in This Case.**

8 Counsel instructed Bertini not to answer questions about the basis for his
 9 interrogatory response that the City does not own the median where Zeleny seeks to protest, so
 10 cannot issue him a permit:

11 Q. All right. Let's – taking that paragraph as a whole that discusses the City's legal
 12 authority and ownership of the median, do you have any basis for knowledge
 13 about that – the information in that paragraph, other than what you've been told
 14 by an attorney?

15 A. No.

16 Q. For purposes of our record, Chief Bertini, what were you told by an attorney
 17 concerning that information?

18 Chief Bertini was not allowed to answer this question. Robinson Decl., Ex. 5 at 262:10-263:8;
 19 *see also generally id.* at pp. 260-263; Robinson Decl., Ex. 7 (Interrogatory Responses).

20 “A party who affirmatively places its attorney-client communications at issue in a
 21 litigation implicitly waives the privilege. The attorney client privilege ‘may not be used both as a
 22 sword and shield.’” *River Rock Comm’cns, Inc. v. Univ. Music Group, Inc.*, 745 F.3d 343, 353
 23 (9th Cir. 2014) (quoting *Chevron Corp. v. Pennzoil Co.*, 974 F.2d 1156, 1162 (9th Cir. 1992)).
 24 It must make a “touch choice” of whether to waive privilege or have the matter excluded.
 25 *Mushroom Assocs. v. Monterey Mushrooms, Inc.*, No. 91-1092, 1992 WL 442892, at *3 (N.D.
 26 Cal. May 19, 1992).

27 The “sword and shield” doctrine applies here. In interrogatory responses, Bertini
 28 asserted that the City cannot issue Zeleny a permit because it does not own the median.² He

² The City did not take this position at any point in the administrative process.

1 admitted that his only basis for this answer was what he had been told by counsel, but counsel
 2 would not allow him to testify about what counsel told him. The City cannot offer testimony
 3 that it does not own the median strip while also claiming that the basis for this testimony is
 4 privileged. *See United States v. \$133,420.00 in U.S. Currency*, 672 F.3d 629, 642 (9th Cir.
 5 2012) (affirming order striking interrogatory response under “sword and shield” doctrine where
 6 witness invoked privilege to avoid answer questions about the response). The City must either
 7 allow discovery into the basis for its contention or waive the contention.

8 **3. The Basis for the City’s Permit Denials Is Not Privileged.**

9 Similarly, the City invoked the privilege in order to avoid disclosing the basis for
 10 its denial of Zeleny’s permits:

11 Q. And the new application was denied through this letter [from the City Attorney];
 12 correct?

13 A. Correct.

14 Q. Do you know if anyone, other than the city attorney’s office, was involved in
 15 making the decision to deny the renewed application or the new application?

16 A. Yes. The city attorney’s office, and I spoke to the city attorney, and it is my
 17 recollection that Matt Milde also spoke to the city attorney.

18 Q. What did you tell the city attorney?

19 **MR. MASTER: Objection. Don’t answer that. That’s attorney-client-privileged.**

20 Robinson Decl., Ex. 6 at 449:7-25; *id.* Ex 8 (Denial Letter). The City cannot hide the basis for
 21 its permit denial simply because it let the City Attorney to make that permitting decision—also
 22 in violation of written policy.

23 “The attorney-client privilege protects confidential disclosures made by a client to
 24 an attorney in order to obtain legal advice, as well as an attorney’s advice in response to such
 25 disclosures.” *In re Grand Jury Investigation*, 974 F.2d 1068, 1070 (9th Cir. 1992). An essential
 26 ingredient is that the person communicating with counsel is seeking legal advice. *United States
 27 v. Richey*, 632 F.3d 559, 566 (9th Cir. 2011). Discussing a permit application with the person
 28 deciding the application is not seeking legal advice—it is seeking the desired permitting
 decision. The bases for an administrative decision cannot be privileged, especially where

1 governmental intent is at issue. *See, e.g., Jones v. Cty. of Coll. Park, Ga.*, 237 F.R.D. 517, 519-
 2 20 (declining to apply deliberative process privilege where “government intent is at issue”).

3 **C. Bertini and Counsel Should Pay the Costs of a Resumed Deposition.**

4 On a successful motion to compel, “the court must … require the party or
 5 deponent whose conduct necessitated the motion, the party or attorney advising that conduct, or
 6 both to pay the movant’s reasonable expenses.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(5)(A). Sanctions are
 7 mandatory unless the movant failed to meet-and-confer in good faith, the opposing party’s
 8 objections were substantially justified, or other circumstances make sanctions unjust. *Id.*

9 There was no legitimate basis for counsel to instruct Bertini not to answer
 10 deposition questions on the grounds of “asked and answered” or that the questions were
 11 “argumentative.” The Federal Rules are abundantly clear that this is improper and sanctionable.
 12 This is particularly true where the questioning was necessitated by Bertini repeatedly evading
 13 questions. *See Hardin*, 2019 WL 1855989, at *4.

14 Sanctions are particularly appropriate here due to the one-two punch of Bertini
 15 giving evasive answers and counsel following up with frivolous objections to further
 16 questioning. This conduct frustrated Zeleny’s ability to complete the deposition efficiently,
 17 wasting extraordinary time. “The court may impose an appropriate sanction—including the
 18 reasonable expenses and attorney’s fees incurred by any person—on a person who impedes,
 19 delays, or frustrates the fair examination of the deponent.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(d)(2).

20 Zeleny seeks a modest sanction of \$2,000, reflecting the estimated costs of
 21 resuming the deposition. Robinson Decl. ¶¶ 7-8. Since the conduct of Bertini and his counsel
 22 necessitated a resumed deposition, they should bear the costs.

23

24 **III. CONCLUSION.**

25 For the foregoing reasons, Bertini should be ordered to answer the questions laid out
 26 above and reasonable follow up questions and he and his counsel should be sanctioned \$1,000.

27 Dated: October 9, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

28 s/ Damion Robinson
David W. Affeld

1 Damion D. D. Robinson
2 David Markevitch
3 Affeld Grivakes LLP

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Attorneys for plaintiff Michael Zeleny

APPENDIX 1

Question and Answer	Grounds for Compelling a Response
Q. And was it your view, at the time that Mr. Zeleny filed his permit application for a special event permit, that the image reflected -- the animation that's shown in Exhibit 38 could be obscene as to minors?	A witness may only be instructed not to answer to preserve privilege, to enforce a court-ordered limitation, or to seek a protective order. Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(c)(2).
A. It could be.	
Q. Did you take that position in a public hearing related to Mr. Zeleny's permit application?	"Asked and answered" is not a proper basis to instruct a witness not to answer.
A. Yes. I stated it could be.	
Q. Do you have a view, one way or another, at this point, about whether it is obscene as to minors or not?	
A. It is actually -- as a police officer, I'm unable to have my peace disturbed, nor be offended, so I have no personal -- I have -- personally, I can't be offended, so it would not be up to me whether it's offensive or not. It would be up to a Court.	
Q. When you say you can't be offended, what do you mean?	
A. In other words, I can't be the victim.	
Q. Okay. In your capacity as an individual witness, is the image offensive? Not asking in your capacity as a police officer, but as an individual witness in this case, is the animation that's reflected in Exhibit 38 offensive?	
MR. MASTER: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous. Confusing. Overbroad. Calls for speculation. If you can answer it.	
A. For an adult, perhaps not; for a child, yeah.	
Q. Do you personally find it offensive?	
MR. MASTER: Objection. Asked and answered. Don't answer that. We're done with this. He's already	

1	answered that question.	
2	Robinson Decl., Ex. 2 at 137:4-139:2.	
3	Q. I'm not asking whether it was right or	
4	wrong for the officer to stop the	
5	vehicle. I'm asking if this conduct of	
6	following a vehicle, engaging in an	
7	enforcement stop, and ... questioning	
8	the driver about his association with a	
9	protestor is consistent with typical	
10	police practice in the city of Menlo	
11	Park.	
12	MR. MASTER: I'm going to continue to	
13	object to that question as being vague and	
14	ambiguous. It's also argumentative, and I'd	
15	like to tell you why, if you'd let me.	
16	MR. ROBINSON: I would appreciate it if you	
17	don't.	
18	MR. MASTER: Okay. Well, then, he can	
19	answer it one more time. And when he's	
20	done with that, he's done with that question,	
21	and we'll move on.	
22	A. So long as the officer had reasonable	
23	suspicion to stop the vehicle, he could	
24	ask any questions, whether it's about a	
25	protestor, whether it's about a drug deal	
26	he just saw, whether it's about a gang	
27	membership he has or a gang person he	
28	just spoke to. That can happen.	
29	Q. Is there any reason you're unable to	
30	answer my question about whether it's	
31	typical police practice to follow a car	
32	like this?	
33	MR. MASTER: Objection. Argumentative.	
34	Asked and answered. Don't answer that	
35	question. Move on.	
36	Robinson Decl., Ex. 3 at 201:5-202:10.	
37		
38	Q. Do you have any other similar binders	
39	of law enforcement sensitive information about	
40	other protesters?	
41	A. Yes.	
42	Q. Which other protesters?	
43	MR. MASTER: Objection. How is that	
44		
45		
46		
47		
48		
49		
50		
51		
52		
53		
54		
55		
56		
57		
58		
59		
60		
61		
62		
63		
64		
65		
66		
67		
68		
69		
70		
71		
72		
73		
74		
75		
76		
77		
78		
79		
80		
81		
82		
83		
84		
85		
86		
87		
88		
89		
90		
91		
92		
93		
94		
95		
96		
97		
98		
99		
100		
101		
102		
103		
104		
105		
106		
107		
108		
109		
110		
111		
112		
113		
114		
115		
116		
117		
118		
119		
120		
121		
122		
123		
124		
125		
126		
127		
128		
129		
130		
131		
132		
133		
134		
135		
136		
137		
138		
139		
140		
141		
142		
143		
144		
145		

1 relevant? And it goes to invasion of privacy.
 2 I'm not sure how it's relevant. Invades privacy
 3 of third parties.

4 Q. Chief Bertini, you can go ahead and
 5 answer the question unless you're instructed
 6 not to.

7 **MR. MASTER: Well, I'm going to instruct
 8 him not to answer that question, Damion,
 9 because it goes to third parties that are not
 10 pertinent or relevant to this litigation. You
 11 can ask him if they are, but, otherwise, I'm
 12 going to instruct him not to answer that
 13 because it goes to the official information
 14 privilege, the legal law and motion privilege
 15 and the designation privilege.**

16 Q. Chief Bertini, I'm not asking you about
 17 the content of any of your materials. All
 18 I'm asking is, do you have -- which
 19 other protesters do you maintain
 20 binders about?

21 MR. MASTER: Well, it's the same objection,
 22 Damion, because you're asking him to identify
 23 individuals by name. So you can ask him for
 24 approximate numbers, something like that, but
 25 if you're identifying third parties, we are, by its
 26 very nature, violating those privileges that I
 27 mentioned before.

28 MR. ROBINSON: I'm not going to argue the
 29 issue with you. You can either instruct or don't
 30 instruct, and we'll reserve our rights.

31 **MR. MASTER: Okay. I'm instructing him
 32 not to answer that.**

33 Robinson Decl., Ex. 4 at 273:10-274:22.

34 privacy interests." *Kelly v. City of San Jose*,
 35 114 F.R.D. 653, 669 (N.D. Cal. 1987). The
 36 City cannot make this showing as to the
 37 mere identity of protestors on which it
 38 maintains surveillance files.

39 Q. All right. Let's -- taking that paragraph
 40 as a whole that discusses the City's
 41 legal authority and ownership of the
 42 median, do you have any basis for
 43 knowledge about that -- the information
 44 in that paragraph, other than what
 45 you've been told by an attorney?

46 A. No.

47 Q. For purposes of our record, Chief
 48 Bertini, what were you told by an
 49 attorney concerning that information?

50 In interrogatory responses, Chief Bertini
 51 contends as a defense that the City does not
 52 own the median strip where Zeleny seeks to
 53 protest so cannot issue him a permit. If
 54 Bertini and the City intend to take this
 55 position at trial, they must disclose the basis
 56 for this understanding. A party cannot use

<p>1 MR. MASTER: Again, just for the record, 2 you're asking Chief Bertini to disclose what 3 he was told by the city attorney's office, the 4 city attorney being the attorney for the City 5 and the staff. Therefore, it calls for him to 6 disclose attorney-client-privileged 7 communications, and I'll instruct him not to 8 answer.</p> <p>9 Robinson Decl., Ex. 5 at 262:10-263:4.</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p>	<p>13 the privilege as a sword and a shield. <i>River</i> 14 <i>Rock Comm'cns, Inc. v. Univ. Music Group,</i> 15 <i>Inc.</i>, 745 F.3d 343, 353 (9th Cir. 2014) 16 (quoting <i>Chevron Corp. v. Pennzoil Co.</i>, 974 17 F.2d 1156, 1162 (9th Cir. 1992)).</p> <p>18</p>
<p>19 Q. And the new application was denied 20 through this letter [from the City 21 Attorney]; correct?</p> <p>22 A. Correct.</p> <p>23 Q. Do you know if anyone, other than the 24 city attorney's office, was involved in 25 making the decision to deny the 26 renewed application or the new 27 application?</p> <p>28 A. Yes. The city attorney's office, and I 29 spoke to the city attorney, and it is my 30 recollection that Matt Milde also spoke 31 to the city attorney.</p> <p>32 Q. What did you tell the city attorney?</p> <p>33 MR. MASTER: Objection. Don't answer 34 that. That's attorney-client-privileged.</p> <p>35 Robinson Decl., Ex. 6 at 449:7-25.</p> <p>36</p> <p>37</p> <p>38</p> <p>39</p> <p>40</p> <p>41</p> <p>42</p> <p>43</p> <p>44</p> <p>45</p> <p>46</p> <p>47</p> <p>48</p> <p>49</p> <p>50</p> <p>51</p> <p>52</p> <p>53</p> <p>54</p> <p>55</p> <p>56</p> <p>57</p> <p>58</p> <p>59</p> <p>60</p> <p>61</p> <p>62</p> <p>63</p> <p>64</p> <p>65</p> <p>66</p> <p>67</p> <p>68</p> <p>69</p> <p>70</p> <p>71</p> <p>72</p> <p>73</p> <p>74</p> <p>75</p> <p>76</p> <p>77</p> <p>78</p> <p>79</p> <p>80</p> <p>81</p> <p>82</p> <p>83</p> <p>84</p> <p>85</p> <p>86</p> <p>87</p> <p>88</p> <p>89</p> <p>90</p> <p>91</p> <p>92</p> <p>93</p> <p>94</p> <p>95</p> <p>96</p> <p>97</p> <p>98</p> <p>99</p> <p>100</p>	<p>101 The City delegated authority to the City 102 Attorney to decide Mr. Zeleny's permit 103 application. In its capacity as the 104 administrative decision-maker, the City 105 Attorney's communications with City staff 106 are not privileged. They form the bases for 107 the City Attorney's administrative decision.</p> <p>108</p> <p>109 The privilege applies to communications 110 seeking legal advice. <i>In re Grand Jury</i> 111 <i>Investigation</i>, 974 F.2d 1068, 1070 (9th Cir. 112 1992). It does not apply to communications 113 seeking to persuade an administrative 114 decision-maker to make a particular decision.</p> <p>115 The City cannot shield the basis for a 116 governmental agency decision by having its 117 counsel make that decision.</p> <p>118</p> <p>119</p> <p>120</p> <p>121</p> <p>122</p> <p>123</p> <p>124</p> <p>125</p> <p>126</p> <p>127</p> <p>128</p> <p>129</p> <p>130</p> <p>131</p> <p>132</p> <p>133</p> <p>134</p> <p>135</p> <p>136</p> <p>137</p> <p>138</p> <p>139</p> <p>140</p> <p>141</p> <p>142</p> <p>143</p> <p>144</p> <p>145</p> <p>146</p> <p>147</p> <p>148</p> <p>149</p> <p>150</p> <p>151</p> <p>152</p> <p>153</p> <p>154</p> <p>155</p> <p>156</p> <p>157</p> <p>158</p> <p>159</p> <p>160</p> <p>161</p> <p>162</p> <p>163</p> <p>164</p> <p>165</p> <p>166</p> <p>167</p> <p>168</p> <p>169</p> <p>170</p> <p>171</p> <p>172</p> <p>173</p> <p>174</p> <p>175</p> <p>176</p> <p>177</p> <p>178</p> <p>179</p> <p>180</p> <p>181</p> <p>182</p> <p>183</p> <p>184</p> <p>185</p> <p>186</p> <p>187</p> <p>188</p> <p>189</p> <p>190</p> <p>191</p> <p>192</p> <p>193</p> <p>194</p> <p>195</p> <p>196</p> <p>197</p> <p>198</p> <p>199</p> <p>200</p> <p>201</p> <p>202</p> <p>203</p> <p>204</p> <p>205</p> <p>206</p> <p>207</p> <p>208</p> <p>209</p> <p>210</p> <p>211</p> <p>212</p> <p>213</p> <p>214</p> <p>215</p> <p>216</p> <p>217</p> <p>218</p> <p>219</p> <p>220</p> <p>221</p> <p>222</p> <p>223</p> <p>224</p> <p>225</p> <p>226</p> <p>227</p> <p>228</p> <p>229</p> <p>230</p> <p>231</p> <p>232</p> <p>233</p> <p>234</p> <p>235</p> <p>236</p> <p>237</p> <p>238</p> <p>239</p> <p>240</p> <p>241</p> <p>242</p> <p>243</p> <p>244</p> <p>245</p> <p>246</p> <p>247</p> <p>248</p> <p>249</p> <p>250</p> <p>251</p> <p>252</p> <p>253</p> <p>254</p> <p>255</p> <p>256</p> <p>257</p> <p>258</p> <p>259</p> <p>260</p> <p>261</p> <p>262</p> <p>263</p> <p>264</p> <p>265</p> <p>266</p> <p>267</p> <p>268</p> <p>269</p> <p>270</p> <p>271</p> <p>272</p> <p>273</p> <p>274</p> <p>275</p> <p>276</p> <p>277</p> <p>278</p> <p>279</p> <p>280</p> <p>281</p> <p>282</p> <p>283</p> <p>284</p> <p>285</p> <p>286</p> <p>287</p> <p>288</p> <p>289</p> <p>290</p> <p>291</p> <p>292</p> <p>293</p> <p>294</p> <p>295</p> <p>296</p> <p>297</p> <p>298</p> <p>299</p> <p>300</p> <p>301</p> <p>302</p> <p>303</p> <p>304</p> <p>305</p> <p>306</p> <p>307</p> <p>308</p> <p>309</p> <p>310</p> <p>311</p> <p>312</p> <p>313</p> <p>314</p> <p>315</p> <p>316</p> <p>317</p> <p>318</p> <p>319</p> <p>320</p> <p>321</p> <p>322</p> <p>323</p> <p>324</p> <p>325</p> <p>326</p> <p>327</p> <p>328</p> <p>329</p> <p>330</p> <p>331</p> <p>332</p> <p>333</p> <p>334</p> <p>335</p> <p>336</p> <p>337</p> <p>338</p> <p>339</p> <p>340</p> <p>341</p> <p>342</p> <p>343</p> <p>344</p> <p>345</p> <p>346</p> <p>347</p> <p>348</p> <p>349</p> <p>350</p> <p>351</p> <p>352</p> <p>353</p> <p>354</p> <p>355</p> <p>356</p> <p>357</p> <p>358</p> <p>359</p> <p>360</p> <p>361</p> <p>362</p> <p>363</p> <p>364</p> <p>365</p> <p>366</p> <p>367</p> <p>368</p> <p>369</p> <p>370</p> <p>371</p> <p>372</p> <p>373</p> <p>374</p> <p>375</p> <p>376</p> <p>377</p> <p>378</p> <p>379</p> <p>380</p> <p>381</p> <p>382</p> <p>383</p> <p>384</p> <p>385</p> <p>386</p> <p>387</p> <p>388</p> <p>389</p> <p>390</p> <p>391</p> <p>392</p> <p>393</p> <p>394</p> <p>395</p> <p>396</p> <p>397</p> <p>398</p> <p>399</p> <p>400</p> <p>401</p> <p>402</p> <p>403</p> <p>404</p> <p>405</p> <p>406</p> <p>407</p> <p>408</p> <p>409</p> <p>410</p> <p>411</p> <p>412</p> <p>413</p> <p>414</p> <p>415</p> <p>416</p> <p>417</p> <p>418</p> <p>419</p> <p>420</p> <p>421</p> <p>422</p> <p>423</p> <p>424</p> <p>425</p> <p>426</p> <p>427</p> <p>428</p> <p>429</p> <p>430</p> <p>431</p> <p>432</p> <p>433</p> <p>434</p> <p>435</p> <p>436</p> <p>437</p> <p>438</p> <p>439</p> <p>440</p> <p>441</p> <p>442</p> <p>443</p> <p>444</p> <p>445</p> <p>446</p> <p>447</p> <p>448</p> <p>449</p> <p>450</p> <p>451</p> <p>452</p> <p>453</p> <p>454</p> <p>455</p> <p>456</p> <p>457</p> <p>458</p> <p>459</p> <p>460</p> <p>461</p> <p>462</p> <p>463</p> <p>464</p> <p>465</p> <p>466</p> <p>467</p> <p>468</p> <p>469</p> <p>470</p> <p>471</p> <p>472</p> <p>473</p> <p>474</p> <p>475</p> <p>476</p> <p>477</p> <p>478</p> <p>479</p> <p>480</p> <p>481</p> <p>482</p> <p>483</p> <p>484</p> <p>485</p> <p>486</p> <p>487</p> <p>488</p> <p>489</p> <p>490</p> <p>491</p> <p>492</p> <p>493</p> <p>494</p> <p>495</p> <p>496</p> <p>497</p> <p>498</p> <p>499</p> <p>500</p> <p>501</p> <p>502</p> <p>503</p> <p>504</p> <p>505</p> <p>506</p> <p>507</p> <p>508</p> <p>509</p> <p>510</p> <p>511</p> <p>512</p> <p>513</p> <p>514</p> <p>515</p> <p>516</p> <p>517</p> <p>518</p> <p>519</p> <p>520</p> <p>521</p> <p>522</p> <p>523</p> <p>524</p> <p>525</p> <p>526</p> <p>527</p> <p>528</p> <p>529</p> <p>530</p> <p>531</p> <p>532</p> <p>533</p> <p>534</p> <p>535</p> <p>536</p> <p>537</p> <p>538</p> <p>539</p> <p>540</p> <p>541</p> <p>542</p> <p>543</p> <p>544</p> <p>545</p> <p>546</p> <p>547</p> <p>548</p> <p>549</p> <p>550</p> <p>551</p> <p>552</p> <p>553</p> <p>554</p> <p>555</p> <p>556</p> <p>557</p> <p>558</p> <p>559</p> <p>560</p> <p>561</p> <p>562</p> <p>563</p> <p>564</p> <p>565</p> <p>566</p> <p>567</p> <p>568</p> <p>569</p> <p>570</p> <p>571</p> <p>572</p> <p>573</p> <p>574</p> <p>575</p> <p>576</p> <p>577</p> <p>578</p> <p>579</p> <p>580</p> <p>581</p> <p>582</p> <p>583</p> <p>584</p> <p>585</p> <p>586</p> <p>587</p> <p>588</p> <p>589</p> <p>590</p> <p>591</p> <p>592</p> <p>593</p> <p>594</p> <p>595</p> <p>596</p> <p>597</p> <p>598</p> <p>599</p> <p>600</p> <p>601</p> <p>602</p> <p>603</p> <p>604</p> <p>605</p> <p>606</p> <p>607</p> <p>608</p> <p>609</p> <p>610</p> <p>611</p> <p>612</p> <p>613</p> <p>614</p> <p>615</p> <p>616</p> <p>617</p> <p>618</p> <p>619</p> <p>620</p> <p>621</p> <p>622</p> <p>623</p> <p>624</p> <p>625</p> <p>626</p> <p>627</p> <p>628</p> <p>629</p> <p>630</p> <p>631</p> <p>632</p> <p>633</p> <p>634</p> <p>635</p> <p>636</p> <p>637</p> <p>638</p> <p>639</p> <p>640</p> <p>641</p> <p>642</p> <p>643</p> <p>644</p> <p>645</p> <p>646</p> <p>647</p> <p>648</p> <p>649</p> <p>650</p> <p>651</p> <p>652</p> <p>653</p> <p>654</p> <p>655</p> <p>656</p> <p>657</p> <p>658</p> <p>659</p> <p>660</p> <p>661</p> <p>662</p> <p>663</p> <p>664</p> <p>665</p> <p>666</p> <p>667</p> <p>668</p> <p>669</p> <p>670</p> <p>671</p> <p>672</p> <p>673</p> <p>674</p> <p>675</p> <p>676</p> <p>677</p> <p>678</p> <p>679</p> <p>680</p> <p>681</p> <p>682</p> <p>683</p> <p>684</p> <p>685</p> <p>686</p> <p>687</p> <p>688</p> <p>689</p> <p>690</p> <p>691</p> <p>692</p> <p>693</p> <p>694</p> <p>695</p> <p>696</p> <p>697</p> <p>698</p> <p>699</p> <p>700</p> <p>701</p> <p>702</p> <p>703</p> <p>704</p> <p>705</p> <p>706</p> <p>707</p> <p>708</p> <p>709</p> <p>710</p> <p>711</p> <p>712</p> <p>713</p> <p>714</p> <p>715</p> <p>716</p> <p>717</p> <p>718</p> <p>719</p> <p>720</p> <p>721</p> <p>722</p> <p>723</p> <p>724</p> <p>725</p> <p>726</p> <p>727</p> <p>728</p> <p>729</p> <p>730</p> <p>731</p> <p>732</p> <p>733</p> <p>734</p> <p>735</p> <p>736</p> <p>737</p> <p>738</p> <p>739</p> <p>740</p> <p>741</p> <p>742</p> <p>743</p> <p>744</p> <p>745</p> <p>746</p> <p>747</p> <p>748</p> <p>749</p> <p>750</p> <p>751</p> <p>752</p> <p>753</p> <p>754</p> <p>755</p> <p>756</p> <p>757</p> <p>758</p> <p>759</p> <p>760</p> <p>761</p> <p>762</p> <p>763</p> <p>764</p> <p>765</p> <p>766</p> <p>767</p> <p>768</p> <p>769</p> <p>770</p> <p>771</p> <p>772</p> <p>773</p> <p>774</p> <p>775</p> <p>776</p> <p>777</p> <p>778</p> <p>779</p> <p>780</p> <p>781</p> <p>782</p> <p>783</p> <p>784</p> <p>785</p> <p>786</p> <p>787</p> <p>788</p> <p>789</p> <p>790</p> <p>791</p> <p>792</p> <p>793</p> <p>794</p> <p>795</p> <p>796</p> <p>797</p> <p>798</p> <p>799</p> <p>800</p> <p>801</p> <p>802</p> <p>803</p> <p>804</p> <p>805</p> <p>806</p> <p>807</p> <p>808</p> <p>809</p> <p>810</p> <p>811</p> <p>812</p> <p>813</p> <p>814</p> <p>815</p> <p>816</p> <p>817</p> <p>818</p> <p>819</p> <p>820</p> <p>821</p> <p>822</p> <p>823</p> <p>824</p> <p>825</p> <p>826</p> <p>827</p> <p>828</p> <p>829</p> <p>830</p> <p>831</p> <p>832</p> <p>833</p> <p>834</p> <p>835</p> <p>836</p> <p>837</p> <p>838</p> <p>839</p> <p>840</p> <p>841</p> <p>842</p> <p>843</p> <p>844</p> <p>845</p> <p>846</p> <p>847</p> <p>848</p> <p>849</p> <p>850</p> <p>851</p> <p>852</p> <p>853</p> <p>854</p> <p>855</p> <p>856</p> <p>857</p> <p>858</p> <p>859</p> <p>860</p> <p>861</p> <p>862</p> <p>863</p> <p>864</p> <p>865</p> <p>866</p> <p>867</p> <p>868</p> <p>869</p> <p>870</p> <p>871</p> <p>872</p> <p>873</p> <p>874</p> <p>875</p> <p>876</p> <p>877</p> <p>878</p> <p>879</p> <p>880</p> <p>881</p> <p>882</p> <p>883</p> <p>884</p> <p>885</p> <p>886</p> <p>887</p> <p>888</p> <p>889</p> <p>890</p> <p>891</p> <p>892</p> <p>893</p> <p>894</p> <p>895</p> <p>896</p> <p>897</p> <p>898</p> <p>899</p> <p>900</p> <p>901</p> <p>902</p> <p>903</p> <p>904</p> <p>905</p> <p>906</p> <p>907</p> <p>908</p> <p>909</p> <p>910</p> <p>911</p> <p>912</p> <p>913</p> <p>914</p> <p>915</p> <p>916</p> <p>917</p> <p>918</p> <p>919</p> <p>920</p> <p>921</p> <p>922</p> <p>923</p> <p>924</p> <p>925</p> <p>926</p> <p>927</p> <p>928</p> <p>929</p> <p>930</p> <p>931</p> <p>932</p> <p>933</p> <p>934</p> <p>935</p> <p>936</p> <p>937</p> <p>938</p> <p>939</p> <p>940</p> <p>941</p> <p>942</p> <p>943</p> <p>944</p> <p>945</p> <p>946</p> <p>947</p> <p>948</p> <p>949</p> <p>950</p> <p>951</p> <p>952</p> <p>953</p> <p>954</p> <p>955</p> <p>956</p> <p>957</p> <p>958</p> <p>959</p> <p>960</p> <p>961</p> <p>962</p> <p>963</p> <p>964</p> <p>965</p> <p>966</p> <p>967</p> <p>968</p> <p>969</p> <p>970</p> <p>971</p> <p>972</p> <p>973</p> <p>974</p> <p>975</p> <p>976</p> <p>977</p> <p>978</p> <p>979</p> <p>980</p> <p>981</p> <p>982</p> <p>983</p> <p>984</p> <p>985</p> <p>986</p> <p>987</p> <p>988</p> <p>989</p> <p>990</p> <p>991</p> <p>992</p> <p>993</p> <p>994</p> <p>995</p> <p>996</p> <p>997</p> <p>998</p> <p>999</p> <p>1000</p>

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 I hereby certify that on October 9, 2020, I electronically filed the foregoing document
3 using the Court's CM/ECF system. I am informed and believe that the CM/ECF system will
send a notice of electronic filing to the interested parties.

4 s/ Gabrielle Bruckner
5 Gabrielle Bruckner

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28